DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 437 AA 000 709

AUTHOR	Lichtman, Jane
TITLE	The Experimental Subcollege.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-12
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	12p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Cluster Colleges, Core Curriculum, *Curriculum Design, *Educational Innovation, *Experimental Colleges, Higher Education, Instructional Innovation, *Relevance (Education), Student College Relationship, Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This report examines the pertinent literature about subcolleges, summarizes their characteristics, and suggests areas for further research. Nine such subcolleges are described in terms of how they were initiated and what programs are offered. These subcolleges were selected for their distinctive characteristics and innovations. They range from schools that accept the parent institution's major educational assumptions but modify its methods, to schools that reject all traditional assumptions. (WM)

ED 051 437

REPORT 12

THE EXPERIMENTAL SUBCOLLEGE

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

JUNE 1971

AA 000 709

1

THE EXPERIMENTAL SUBCOLLEGE

by

Jane Lichtman

Report 12

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

June 1971

FOREWORD

This report examines the pertinent literature about subcolleges, summarizes their characteristics, and suggests areas for further research. Nine such subcolleges are described in terms of how they were initiated and what programs are offered. These subcolleges were selected for their distinctive characteristics and innovations. They range from schools that accept the parent institution's major educational assumptions but modify its methods, to schools that reject all traditional assumptions. The author, Jane Lichtman, is currently gathering data about free university programs across the U.S.

The twelfth in a series of reports on various aspects of higher education, this paper represents one of several types of clearinghouse publications. Others include annotated bibliographies and short reviews, based on recent significant literature found in and outside the ERIC collection. In addition, the current research literature of higher education is indexed and abstracted for publication in the U.S. Office of Education's monthly volume *Research in Education*. Readers who wish to order ERIC documents cited in the bibliography should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Box Drawer 0, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. When ordering please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Payment for microfiche (MF) or hard/photocopies (HC) must accompany orders of less than $10.00. All orders must be in writing.

Carl J. Lange, *Director*
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
June 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
NINE SUBCOLLEGES	4
BIBLIOGRAPHY	8

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The creation of experimental colleges or units within universities or university systems is an inclusive response to demands for educational reform. Designed to provide an alternative method of educating undergraduates, these "subcolleges" represent a much greater innovation than the more popular changes in patterns of governance–e.g., addition of an ombudsman or incorporation of "relevant" curricular programs, such as black or women's studies. Although such limited innovations are receiving greater attention, literature on the innovative college units is on the increase, as more and more of these subcolleges appear and expand their programs. In *The Cluster College* (1970), Jerry Gaff examines the growth of subcolleges, the reasons for their creation, and typical patterns of organization. Other chapters in this study are by Heist and Bilorusky, Newcomb, Wofford, and Martin and Wilkinson, who describe their work with various innovative collegiate units.

Generally, however, the literature is confined to descriptions of individual programs, most of which can be divided into two types: (1) the innovative campus consisting of a group of integrated, small, semiautonomous colleges that are part of a large university system (e.g., the University of California, Santa Cruz); and (2) the subcollege located on its parent institution's campus, but peripheral to its philosophy and programs (e.g., Bensalem, a unit of Fordham University). In the first case, the state university system provides for the establishment of a branch campus under mandate to experiment with mass education techniques. The new institution is composed of independent colleges which share central administrative facilities. In the second case, an older college or university develops within its own structure a unit that will utilize a small portion of the university's resources to experiment with learning techniques, yet not wreck the total university if the experiment fails.

The first part of this report will review the pertinent literature about these subcolleges, summarize their characteristics, and suggest areas for further research. The second section will describe a number of specific institutions in order that the reader may know what is presently available within American higher education, and what is involved in being a participant in or initiating an innovative subcollege. The institutions were selected for their distinctive characteristics and innovations. They range from schools which accept the parent institution's major educational assumptions but modify its educational methods (Jefferson House Program), to schools which reject all traditional assumptions (Bensalem).

An Alternative

Recently, a multitude of evidence has been published documenting the lack of options available to the public in today's colleges and universities (Martin, 1968a; Hodgkinson, 1970). Viewed from an historical and international perspective, American higher education is exceedingly pluralistic. Despite this ostensible diversity, however, the structure of American higher education reflects adherence to a single model characterized by departmentalization, professionalism, and specialization along traditional academic lines. Whether we look at 2-year colleges, 4-year liberal arts institutions, universities or multiversities, the trend remains constant: each strives to be a larger "versity" (Martin, 1968a). As a recent Carnegie Commission report notes, the great size of the whole educational enterprise has been accomplished by increasing the number of students registered at existing public institutions instead of increasing the number of public institutions themselves. "We have decided to build a 20-room house rather than twenty houses of one room each" (Hodgkinson, 1970).

The new subcolleges, however, indicate a trend counter to that of increasing size and specialization. Subcolleges are attempting to provide for the student a liberal arts education in a smaller, more personalized environment that will allow him to prepare for the future in new ways (see Toffler's *Future Shock*) and to perceive the effects of an automated society (impersonality, mass conformity, poverty, anonymity and resulting apathy) without actually experiencing them in his own educational experience.

Common Characteristics

The literature on these subcolleges reflects their common characteristics.

1. *They are small.* Although the "smallness" is relative (Gaff, 1970), the objective of limited size is to arouse effective group loyalties (McHenry, 1964) and thereby reduce the sense of impersonality within the institution and encourage student involvement in and responsibility for their own education.

2. *They offer alternative liberal arts curricula.* Rather than seeking to provide the ideal general education curriculum, subcolleges often multiple curricula in the liberal arts (Spurr, 1968). Curricular variations may be problem-centered, three-tiered, or otherwise structured (Martin, 1968a). Subcolleges have gone beyond the academic disciplines by placing conventional disciplines within the

context of larger areas of knowledge, social problems, intellectual themes, important men, or historical periods; by offering core curricula; or by encouraging specialization, normally through courses offered by other colleges of the university and independent study (Gaff, 1970).

3. *Their educational methods are flexible.* Subcolleges have initiated academic innovations that encourage independent study, student-formed seminars, tutorials, participation in academic governance, closer student-faculty working relations, and academic calendar variations (Martin, 1968a). They are also experimenting with new methods of evaluation and make occasional use of outside examiners and written descriptions of a student's work in place of letter grades. As an alternative to the "credit-unit" system, they are varying the time length from the traditional 4 years, offering the "contract" system whereby a student and faculty advisor determine what the student will accomplish, and offering credit for service activities such as field work, the Peace Corps, apprenticeships and assistantships.

4. *They are residential.* Classrooms, faculty offices and living arrangements as well as student living quarters are often located in the same area.

5. *They generally enjoy a considerable measure of autonomy from the sponsoring university* (Martin, 1968a). At the same time, the educational change generated by subcolleges are legitimized by the fact that they operate under the aegis of established institutions.

6. *They utilize central administrative facilities–usually those of the university.* This involves sharing academic facilities (libraries, laboratories), social and extracurricular activities, student personnel services (health services, psychological and vocational counseling, dormitory supervision, student discipline, and financial aid), and cooperating in financial and administrative matters by using the central business, development, public relations and records offices as well as maintenance and recruitment facilities (Gaff, 1970).

Research Findings

The creation of an experimental college on the campus of a large multiversity encourages the development of an atmosphere different from that of the parent school. The success or failure of subcolleges in achieving the objectives for which they are created is a subject of ever increasing inquiry.

Methodology. In order to assess whether subcolleges do indeed foster an environment that is different in certain ways, most research studies compare a sample of subcollege students to students attending the parent university. However, throughout the ensuing discussion of the characteristics of the new subcolleges, it is important to keep in mind one factor (the Hawthorne Effect discussed by Trow, 1967) which may exaggerate the significance of research results:

> Much of the success of an "experimental" course is related to the fact that it is a break in routine which forces a higher level of imagination and energy from the staff and excites it in the student. The sheer innovative character of such an "experiment," coupled with its typically rich endowment or resources by the institution, almost ensures its success independent of its purposeful content.

The problem of how to distinguish side effects from designed effects may be answerable only after a longer period of time has elapsed. Many experimental colleges (New College at Columbia, Black Mountain, Meiklejohn's Experimental College at Wisconsin) have failed to last beyond 7 years (Watson, 1964). Watson and Gaff (1970) wonder whether these colleges can survive after the initial ideas and practices of their utopian founders have become standard and the founders have left. Once new ideas are accepted, it is difficult to maintain a spirit of experimentation.

These are some of the difficulties that innovative subcolleges created in the sixties are encountering. They are losing their devoted, intensely involved elite group of participants, and must now find a means to sustain a sense of innovation and achieve desired objectives in the face of a more sophisticated student population and well established programs.

Entering Students. In comparing entering students in the innovative subcolleges with students who do not choose to attend the subcollege, researchers have sought to discover whether there is an element of self-selection on the part of students who choose to enter the innovative unit.

There is evidence that students who choose to enter the experimental subcollege have higher intellectual aptitudes and achievement than do those entering the parent institutions (Gaff, Newcomb, Heist and Bilorusky, 1970; Riesman, 1970). Hofstra's New College ensures this by admitting only the elite honor students of the University. However, this is not always the case. Freshmen at Raymond College–a subcollege of the University of the Pacific to which any student may apply–were found to have higher College Entrance Examination Board aptitude scores and were more likely to have graduated in the top 10 percent of their class than other students at the College of the Pacific (Gaff, 1967). Even when efforts are made to see that the students in an innovative college represent a cross-section of the university (e.g., the Residential College at the University of Michigan, Newcomb's studies), self-selection by the honors students who preferred enrolling in the Residential College to the Honors College leaves us without a control for the fact that entering students in the researched subcolleges have statistically higher records of high school achievement and aptitude.

Along with having higher aptitudes, subcollege student entrants are more concerned with ideas and more intellectually oriented (Newcomb, Gaff, Heist and Bilorusky, 1970; Olson, 1968; Martin, 1969a). They show greater

interest in flexible uses of intelligence and in esthetic areas (Newcomb, Heist and Bilorusky, 1970), and are more academically (and less vocationally) oriented than both nationwide samples of students and students who attend their own parent university, (Heist and Bilorusky, 1970; Newcomb, Gaff, Olson, 1968). Subcollege students are much more likely than the control groups to emphasize development of critical thinking and a "broad general outlook" both at the beginning of and later in their college career (Heist and Bilorusky, 1970). There is no evidence, however, that subcollege students are either more mature or better socially adjusted at entrance (Heist and Bilorusky, 1970; Newcomb).

Environment. Subcollege students consider their college to be distinctive when compared to other parts of their university (Henry, Martin and Wilkinson). This uniqueness attracts students and faculty who are more likely to be aware of and agree with the innovative educational goals of the subcollege than are students attending the regular university (Martin and Wilkinson, 1970). Subcollege students envision their ideal college as experimental, whereas students in other units of the university are likely to conceive of education in traditional terms (Martin and Wilkinson, Heist and Bilorusky, 1970).

Students in the innovative subcolleges are also more likely to consider the subcollege environment warm and supportive. Although subcollege students do not expect their new environment to be more or less intellectual than the rest of the college, they are more likely to expect congeniality and fairness in social and academic relations (Newcomb). They are more likely to say that the standards set by professors are not hard to achieve and that the professors go out of their way to help them (Gaff, 1967). At the University of Michigan, students in the Residential College were more likely than students in the regular College of Literature, Science and the Arts to say that faculty members call students by their first name and take an interest in their personal problems (Newcomb). At the Residential College, faculty members were expected by the students to be friendly and fair, and to set reasonable goals.

Students in innovative subcolleges are less likely to respond to questions concerning values with stereotyped responses. They are likely to approve of traits in professors such as "sets at ease," "encourages self-discovery," and "leads to independence rather than discipleship" (Cassidy). After 1 year at the residential college at the University of Michigan, Newcomb found a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus at which the faculty-student involvement was strongly supportive of intellectual growth. Students were more satisfied with faculty, administration and other students than were control students not at the Residential College. Shaw (1970) found that senior students, after 4 years at Justin Morrill College, perceived the atmosphere as one characterized by "community" (see also Newcomb; Gaff, 1970). Classroom experiences were intimate and relaxed (Shaw, 1970; Gaff, 1967). Students continued to be socially involved and active.

The third general characteristic of the subcollege environment is one of intellectual liveliness. Consistently in the studies cited, students perceived the college as encouraging intellectual pursuits and discouraging collegiate group activities such as pep rallies and "fun-and-games" events (Gaff, 1967).

Needed Research

Subcollege environments have been found to be different from those of larger units with which they have been compared, and, in that sense, have attained one of the objectives for which they were created (Gaff, 1967). However, as in most new areas of study in which literature is scarce, questions outnumber answers. This section will indicate parts of this realm of vast uncertainty.

Students. If a matched sample were attained, would students with equal ability fare better in the more personalized environment? Do incoming students know that they need the environment of the subcollege (Kells, 1968)? Do admissions officers identify the appropriate students? What student characteristics are necessary for success in subcolleges? For graduation? For maximum learning? For dropping out of the subcollege?

Faculty. What characteristics distinguish faculty of subcolleges from those not in the subcolleges? What is the response of the faculty to a "more personal environment?" What is the optimum arrangement for the faculty; A division of time between the larger unit and his own department? A full-time, temporary appointment "on-leave" from the parent college? Primary identification with the subcollege? What are the implications for success in his field?

Environment. What are the necessary and sufficient ingredients for an effective environment? For whom? How critical is student body size, specific curricular and teaching innovations, relationship to the parent institution? Can effective environments be created for different types of students? Are there differences between subcolleges at research oriented universities and those at smaller, teaching oriented schools (Gaff, 1970)?

Costs. Is a more personal environment more expensive?

Organization. What organizational structures are most effective in protecting the cirricular prerogatives of subcollege faculty while maintaining a central administration, responsibility and satisfaction. What administrative structures yield a balance of power that does not stifle implementation of cooperative efforts or innovation?

Evaluation. To which objectives should evaluation be directed? If to learning, how is that measured? What has been the impact of subcolleges on parent institutions? Are

innovations confined to the one unit that is experimenting or are they transferred from the experimental unit to the rest of the university? What is the effect of creating a new college on the other university structures (Keeley, 1969)?

II. NINE SUBCOLLEGES

The second part of this paper describes nine innovative subcolleges, focusing on the distinctive elements and creative innovations of each in order to give the reader some idea of how much variation these institutions bring to the mosaic of higher education.

University of the Pacific

The first illustration, that of the University of the Pacific, is presented mainly because it represents a historical break from tradition and is therefore one of the pioneers of subsequent subcollege developments. As narrated by Meyer (1964), the circumstances in which the College of the Pacific found itself in the late 1950s were bleak. It was surrounded by an incredibly large complex of publicly financed higher education. With its traditional commitment to a small, religious and friendly campus catering mainly to undergraduates, President Robert E. Burns decided that the college could not compete with the areas of strength in the vast system of higher education in California, but instead could concentrate on maintaining the virtues of the smallness and intimacy of the small church-related school. His speech, delivered in 1959 at the College of the Pacific, now overshadows the present, rapidly developing subcollege phonomenon:

> Let us grow larger by growing smaller. Let us develop around the university a cluster of colleges which will retain the values we cherish so much and, yet, will, at the same time, make it possible for us to accept some responsibility for educating the increasing number of young people seeking to enter the institutions of higher learning in California. Let us follow the Oxford and Cambridge system and expand by establishing small, interrelated colleges clustered together to draw strength from each other and from the University as a whole (Meyer, 1964).

Since the characteristics of the new colleges at the University of the Pacific, which are described by Gaff (1967) and Meyer (1964), are the same as those of most of the subcolleges described, they are treated here in more length than in the rest of the descriptions. Each new college at the University of the Pacific was: to be small with a maximum enrollment of 250 students; to have its own faculty and chief administrative officer; to have a residential arrangement for a living-learning community; to be part of the University with the same board of regents and president; to share essential services such as business, admissions, records and the public relations and development offices with the other colleges; to use the library, classroom, laboratory, athletic and health service facilities on the main campus.

Two years later, the first subcollege, Raymond College, was opened. It emphasizes a general liberal arts education in three divisions: the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. Its "curriculum and methodology [aim] to confront the student with ways of thinking; the meaning of personal identity, involvement and social responsibility; and the necessity of hard thinking and good judgments."

How well did Raymond College succeed? Jerry Gaff, (1967) who has done the most extensive research on the College, concluded:

> [Raymond] has demonstrated that a liberating college career can be as short as three years; that students can become deeply engrossed in studying only three courses at once; that all students can benefit by freedom from regular courses and permission to pursue independent study; that seminars can move the students and faculty out of their stereotyped academic roles and lead them to honestly think together; that there is a workable alternative to the usual academic grading game; and that by bringing students and faculty together in a living and learning environment they can view each other more honestly and more charitably.

In addition to Raymond, there are presently two other subcolleges at the University of the Pacific. The first, Elbert Covell, gives all instruction in Spanish, striving to: (1) train men and women as "inter-American specialists"; (2) give Latin American students the opportunity for a quality education in their own language; and (3) give students from all the Americas the opportunity to live and to study together (*University of the Pacific Bulletin 1968-70).* The second, Callison College, has a curriculum which emphasizes the history and culture of the non-Western world. As part of its 4-year curriculum, students spend their sophomore year in residence on a university-operated campus in an emerging non-Western nation.

University of California, Santa Cruz

While the University of the Pacific established the first plan for a series of subcolleges, the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California is the most comprehensively planned multiversity providing for the integration of residential, interdisciplinary subcolleges. In 1962, the Regents of the University gave approval for a provisional academic plan which called for: (1) an initial emphasis on undergraduate instruction; (2) early faculty strength in the humanities and social sciences; (3) a series of undergraduate residential colleges as the basic units for the planning; and (4) initial grouping of the faculty into three

divisions–humanities, sciences, and social sciences–rather than the conventional departments (Lamb, 1964).

With a forecasted student population of 27,500 students, Chancellor Dean McHenry decided that the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California (UCSC) would develop into a series of liberal arts colleges with an average of 600 students, most of whom would live at the college. At its maximum, the Santa Cruz campus would have twenty of these colleges. Different colleges would have different provosts, faculties, student bodies, location, architecture, facilities, traditions, conditions of growth, and sizes.

Presently there are five of these colleges (*UCSC 1969-70*). Following the master plan closely, the first three concentrate in the major areas of humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The fourth focuses on problems of poverty in the United States and underdevelopment abroad. The fifth addresses the arts, the fine arts and the popular arts in the twentieth century. College VI, to open in 1971, is concerned with the modern sciences and their social context.

The Third College, University of California, San Diego

Subsequent to UCSC, the California Master Plan called for the parallel development of another equal sized campus of the University in San Diego (Alexander, 1963). The Third College illustrates the latitudes of posssibilities when a campus is conceived as the parallel development of innovative, autonomous, yet cooperating colleges. As stated in the *1970-71 General Catalog,* the College places primary emphasis on the education of minority groups and the alleviation of contemporary social problems. Toward these aims, core courses and interdepartmental majors are offered in the following areas: (1) "Science and Technology" is intended to give students insight into the nature of science and its relevance to their lives. (2) "Urban and Rural Development" introduces students to the dimensions of urban crises. (3) "Third World Studies" acquaints students with non-Western cultures (a focus of subcolleges at both the University of the Pacific and UCSC). (4) "Communications" helps students in the arts of expression. Majors differ from those offered by other colleges by emphasizing "application to contemporary social problems" (*General Catalog*).

This academic plan was drafted by joint faculty-student committees. The governance of the college is by three elected students, two elected faculty members, and the Provost.

State University of New York, College at Old Westbury

The master planning for the State University of New York's College at Old Westbury (SUNYCOW) follows in the footsteps of Santa Cruz as an innovative segment of a state university system. However, subsequent developments have made the Santa Cruz campus a more stable element in the University of California system than the Old Westbury school in the SUNY system.

The 1966 Master Plan definitely had a vision of the new College at Old Westbury as an experimenting unit. It stated that the College would (1) end the lock-step pace by admitting qualified students without high school diplomas and grant baccalaureate degrees without regard to the length of time with the school; (2) admit students to "full partnership" in the academic world; (3) use contemporary technology to free faculty to concentrate on a meaningful exchange with students, to do research, and to create.

With these three guidelines and a staff of consultants headed by its president, Harris Wofford, SUNYCOW opened in 1968 with 87 students and 15 faculty. It offered a 4-year work-study curriculum focused on urban problems. The College arranged for its students to live and work in urban areas so they could understand the problems first-hand from the viewpoint of the people most directly afflicted with them. In 1970, there were three colleges: the Disciplines College, the Urban Studies College, and the General Program for students who did not yet wish to enter one of the constituent colleges. With a heavy emphasis on independent study, seminars and field work, evaluation of the student is on a Pass/No Credit basis. The Disciplines College adds another category, Pass with Distinction (*State University of New York: College of Old Westbury, Statement of Academic Plans 1969-70*)

It is significant that each of the constituent colleges was designed to be innovative; and yet, each of these colleges was to have no rights of tenure:

> In calling for the formation of one constituent college after another over a number of years, and not giving unlimited life to any one college curriculum, but rather exposing each to continuing criticism and review, the opportunity for innovation and creativity will be extended far beyond the initial planning. Through these "visions and revisions" Old Westbury will seek to give education the impetus and invigoration of a continuing experiment (*Statement of First Program, September, 1968*).

There has been more published literature on SUNYCOW than on any other college included here. Most of it is in the form of self-described "confessions" of its President, Harris Wofford. This includes, for example, the difficulties of defining the school's educational purpose–e.g., should the college be devoted to the life of the scholar and the contemplative community or should the curriculum emphasize active involvement in real life and the problems of minority groups?) The debate in the March, 1969 issue of *Change,* "The College that Students Helped Plan," indicates some of the problems in starting a new school with few prescriptions and much to be

developed "organically" (Wofford's term). "The confrontation between 'hip students' and us 'up-tight neoclassicists' has made it clear how difficult it will be to make the tensions creative–to achieve the dialectic that goes beyond confrontation."

With little definition of responsibilities, the faculty were also confused. One professor, Jay Neugeboren, says he arrived hopeful that it would be possible to establish an experimental college in the SUNY system (Neugeboren, 1970). However, he quickly realized that:

> It was–despite its miniature size–a college like other colleges; it was neither "relevant" nor "experimental"–[merely] another stop in the suburban shopping center, one where students who did not have to work for a living or for expenses could talk endlessly about the "right" to choose and plan and have all the varieties of courses and programs and education their minds could imagine.

Before Wofford left SUNYCOW for the presidency of Bryn Mawr, his greatest difficulty seemed to be establishing agreement for the words "full partnership" of the Master Plan (Wofford, 1970). To the students, it meant one-man-one-vote; to Wofford it meant the encouragement of three strong constituent bodies of students, faculty, and administration with separate powers and responsibilities. Since Wofford left, SUNYCOW has been unusually silent. The literature on SUNYCOW, wrought with confusion, disillusionment, and disappointment contrasts with meagre reports from the universities already mentioned which seem to be moving forward steadily, if perhaps a bit more slowly than anticipated, toward predictions made for them in the early '60s.

Antioch College, Columbia

The creation of innovative campuses is not limited to public higher education. A branch campus of Antioch College in Ohio was opened in the new, developing town of Columbia, Maryland in 1969. According to Judson Jerome (1970), the college is intended to enable Antioch College in Ohio to engage in continued experimentation without upsetting the continuity of the main program and, at the same time, to exert a certain pressure on the home campus to innovate. The commitment to work-as-study and to the wide participation of all elements of the community in decisions has been transferred from the older campus to the new. According to Jerome (1970), students are involved in the community: working with young people setting-up centers for teen meetings and discussions, providing the impetus for an alternate high school, a draft counseling center, and attempting to establish a radio communications network between the different planned cities. All decisions are subject to community ratification. The three elected faculty and six elected students are subject to immediate recall if their decisions conflict with the desires of the community. Student curricular programs are highly individualized; evaluation is in the form of a written letter of progress submitted by each faculty member with whom the student works.

Paracollege, St. Olaf College

The Paracollege, too, was designed to be an experimenting unit of St. Olaf's College; but rather than being separated from its parent campus by 500 miles, it is located at St. Olaf. According to the *St. Olaf College Catalog, 1970-71,* the Paracollege accepts the regular objectives of St. Olaf's, but it also aims: (1) to be an experimenting unit to find new or different means to achieve the goals of a liberal arts education; (2) to emphasize interdisciplinary and integrative studies; and (3) to have students assume more responsibility for their own education.

In order to achieve these objectives, the curriculum is three-tiered, requiring students to complete a "general examination", a "comprehensive examination" of the student's knowledge in his major along with his knowledge in non-Western studies and religion, and a "senior thesis." There is a heavy emphasis on independent study (Gaff, 1970). For each of the areas on the general examination, the student is given a syllabus and has access to a tutor. Lectures and discussion groups are held, but none are mandatory. The objective is to have the student assume the responsibility for his own education by using the resources available to him–readings, audits, and courses which can help him to prepare for the examinations. Paracollege is planned for an eventual 500 students.

Jefferson House, Florida Presbyterian College

Jefferson House Plan of Florida Presbyterian College is much smaller, planned for 60 students. Like the Paracollege, however, the "first principle" of the Jefferson House program is "the conviction that the basic educational philosophy and program of Florida Presbyterian College is a sound one" ("A Letter to the Faculty from the Fellows of Jefferson House"). However, at Jefferson House, the standard curriculum furnishes a reference point; the student must justify any major deviation as a potential improvement. What is unusual about this program is that its tentativeness is so explicity and succinctly stated:

> Jefferson House is granted extensive autonomy in its operation, but there is no presumption that it should continue beyond the five years of the initial experiment. If, short of that time it becomes reasonably apparent that it is not functioning to the best interests of the students, it should be terminated ("A Letter to the Faculty from the Fellows of Jefferson House.")

It would be interesting to find out whether this "condition encourages or inhibits the willingness to innovate in the Jefferson House.

Bensalem, Fordham University

Perhaps the college which is most different from its parent institution is Bensalem, a college of Fordham University. Begun in 1967, it provides a residential experience for the six faculty members and 60 students who live there. In the articles and descriptions of Bensalem, there is a heavy concern given to the pervasiveness and potency of this residential experience, especially for the faculty members (Jerome, 1970). When a faculty member can see students five times a week, at certain hours, and then leave them, he has some measure of control; when he has to live with them, hear their rock music blaring at 3:00 in the morning, and feel that he is "the bad guy because [he] is getting paid," it can become a pretty hostile place (says Ken Freeman, Dean). Elizabeth Sewell, the first Dean of Bensalem says:

> If I had to characterize our worst enemy during this first year of ours, I would say it was fear and mistrust. Simply by committing ourselves to Bensalem and what it implied, we had moved out of the tidy delimited ordered world . . . we had lived in for most of our lives."

But, 3 years later, Bensalem is still in very much the same form that it was in 1967. It has no fixed curriculum, no credit system, and no grades. All decisions are made either democratically on a one-man-one-vote basis or by concensus, including such areas as faculty evaluation and hiring, admissions, and budget allocations ("Bensalem College–A Description"). The only expectation of the student is that he maintain a cumulative log of what he is doing, which is actually his transcript:

> Minimally, if a student signed a slip of paper which said "I went to Bensalem for three years," and a faculty member signed it saying, "Joe Doaks went to Bensalem for three years," the student would be awarded the degree. In spirit, however . . . there is recognition that the degree requires a continuing relationship between student and faculty, symbolized by a growing transcript–which is a kind of journal with running descriptions of the student's activities and comments by the faculty (Jerome, 1970).

Normally, however, learning together at Bensalem takes the form of workshops, seminars, group projects and informal discussions. Students have established a children's school and a literary magazine.

Johnston College, University of the Redlands

Both Bensalem and Johnston College are very much concerned with individual development; however, the form in which this is fostered differs widely on each campus. Whereas Bensalem is non-structured, Johnston College is highly structured.

Johnston was created to "provide through continuous experimentation, a testing of directions in which the total University can move." Its first innovation is the interdisciplinary nature of its three areas of study: The interpersonal, intercultural, and international.

To help the students and faculty in self-development and in the development of a more active community, a 10-day mountain retreat is held each year at the start of the regular fall semester (*Time,* 10/3/69). At these lively retreats attended by students, faculty, administrators and representatives of the Board of Overseers, two purposes are served (*Johnston College: 1969 Bulletin*). First, the entire community is involved in evaluating and relating to the College's basic guidelines; and, second, an environment in which a basis for personal understanding and sense of community can be established is provided. The retreat includes training laboratories in personal growth for all members of the community.

To follow up the individualized introduction, all requirements for graduation are fitted to the student. A student's program consists of a "contract" that he works out with an advisor in his freshman year. As explained in "Contractual Relationship Between Student and College," the contract states the student's educational objectives and how he plans to go about realizing them. When the student feels that he has met the terms of the contract, he can go to his faculty committee–composed of three members from each of the three areas of study–to show that he has met his educational objectives. Each contract, before it is approved, must be planned to satisfy 11 stipulations, including: learning a foreign language, participating in a physical education program, gaining an awareness of contemporary problems, mastery of several important learning methodologies, assuming independence in his studies, meeting state requirements, having a cross-cultural experience, satisfying professional objectives, integrating knowledge, and concentrating in an area of study reflected in a written report of an extended work project or internship.

In order to help the student attain these objectives, students and faculty meet regularly in seminars, tutorials and laboratories (*Johnston College: 1969 Bulletin*). Each year, the students examine core questions in each of the three dimensions of learning. Seminars define issues and problems and provide the student with a working relationship with a small group of students; laboratories provide him with an opportunity to test the seminar theories against the behavior of others in the small group; and tutorials enable two to three students to meet once a week with their advisor. Interdisciplinary work and independent study are encouraged; evaluation is continuous, written, and personal and includes a description of a person's strengths and weaknesses with regard to his objectives and potential.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Robert E. "Long Range Development Plan, University of California, San Diego." October 1963. ED 031 877. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Cassidy, Sally. "Monteith College." In *New Designs for Liberal Arts Colleges,* edited by George Bonham. Colorado: Loretto Heights College, December 1966. ED 014 305. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29

Constructive Changes to Ease Campus Tensions. Washington: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, January 1970.

Dressel, Paul L. "Educational Innovation at Michigan State University." In *Experimental Colleges,* edited by W. Hugh Stickler. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1964, pp. 121-132.

Fischer, John. "A Different Kind of Campus." *Harpers,* July 1969. (University of California, Santa Cruz)

Foote, Caleb; Mayer, Henry and Associates. *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Gaff, Jerry G. *Innovations and Consequences: A Study of Raymond College, University of the Pacific,* Stockton, Calipo, 1967.

____. "Innovation and Evaluation: A Case Study." *Educational Record,* Summer 1969, pp. 290-99.

____. *The Cluster College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Hamlin, Will and Porter, Lawrence, eds. *Dimensions of Changes in Higher Education.* Workshop Conferences to Foster Innovation in Higher Education (First Magnolia Manor, Mass., May 19-23, 1966.)

Heist, Paul and Bilorusky, John. "A Special Breed of Student." In *The Cluster College,* edited by Jerry G. Gaff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970, pp. 71-104.

Henry, Mildred. "Faculty and Student Variables in 3 Different Climates of Learning." In *New Designs for Liberal Arts Colleges,* edited by George Bonham. Colorado: Loretto Heights College, December 1966. ED 014 305. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Hodgkinson, Harold. *Institutions in Transition: A Study of Change in Higher Education.* New York: Carnegie Foundation, 1970.

Hofstra University General Bulletin. New York: Hofstra University, March 1970

Jerome, Judson. *Culture out of Anarchy: The Reconstruction of American Higher Learning.* New York: Herder and Herder, 1970. Describes Bensalem, College at Old Westbury, Antioch-Columbia.

____. "Portrait of Three Experiments." *Change Magazine,* July-August, 1970, pp. 40-54.

The Journal of Higher Education. October 1967. Entire issue devoted to the conference on the cluster college concept.

Justin Morrill College Program Planning Handbook. East Lansing: Michigan State University (Midi).

Keeley, Benjamin. "Consequences of Change: A Case for Guidelines." *College and University Business,* October 1969, pp. 57-59.

Kells, H.R. "A Significant Problem Deserving Study: The Cluster College." In *Institutional Research and Academic Outcomes,* edited by Cameron Fincher. Proceedings of the 8th Annual Forum on Institutional Research, San Francisco, California, 1968.

____ and Steward, Clifford T. "A Summary of the Working Sessions." *Journal of Higher Education,* May 1969, pp. 359-63.

Klein, Donald. *The 1969-1970 New Division Prospectus: A Legacy.* Springville, Me.: Society for Educational Ventures, 1969. Nasson's New Division–report from a proponent.

Lamb, Karl A. "Seeking the Essence of Oxford." *American Oxonian,* April 1964.

Lienemann, William H. and Sochen, June. "A Little College Within a Large College." *The Journal of Higher Education,* May 1969, pp. 389-93.

Lienemann, William H. "Mini Colleges in a Commuter Institution." *The Journal of Higher Education,* April 1968, pp. 218-21.

McHenry, Dean E. "Small College Program for a Large University." *College and University Business,* July 1964, pp. 31-33. University of California, Santa Cruz.

____. "The University of California, Santa Cruz." In *Experimental Colleges,* edited by W. Hugh Stickler. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964, pp. 133-44.

Martin, Warren Bryan. *Alternative to Irrelevance: Strategy for Reform in Higher Education.* New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

____. *Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969a.

____ and Wilkinson, Judith K. "Non-Differences that Make a Difference." *Research Reporter,* 1969b. ED 036 282. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

____. "Making a Difference." In *The Cluster College,* edited by Jerry G. Gaff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970, pp. 161-78.

Meyer, Samuel L. "The University of the Pacific and its 'Cluster Colleges'." In *Experimental Colleges,* edited by W. Hugh Stickler. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1964, pp. 73-90.

Nasson College Bulletin: The New Division Catalogue Issue. Springville, Me.: Nasson College, 1967-8.

Neugeboren, Jay. "Your Suburban Alternative." *Esquire,* August 1970, p. 113. Describes College at Old Westbury.

Newcomb, Theodore M. and Associates. "Self-Selection and Change." In *The Cluster College,* edited by Jerry G. Gaff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970, pp. 137-60.

____, Brown, D.R., Kulik, J.A., Reimer, D.J. and Revelle, W.R. "A Small Residential Community Compared with Three Control Populations." Unpublished Manuscript. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1969.

Olson, LeRoy A. "Residential Colleges in a Large University." In *Institutional Research and Academic Outcomes,* edited by Cameron Fincher. Proceedings of the 8th Annual Forum on Institutional Research, San Francisco, California, 1968.

Redcliffe-Maud, Lord, "Oxford and the Collegiate University Idea." *The Journal of Higher Education,* October 1967, pp. 373-78.

The Residential College Announcement. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1967-8.

Riesman, David, Gusfield, Joseph and Gamson, Zelda. *Academic Values and Mass Education: The Early Years of Oakland and Monteith.* New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Rohman, D. Gordon. "Justin Morrill College at Michigan State." In *Dimensions of Changes in Higher Education,* edited by Hamlin and Porter, Magnolia Manor: Massachusetts, 1966.

____ "The Two Clocks of Justin Morrill." In *The Residential College Concept in American Higher Education.* 1967. ED 030 377. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Ross, Woodburn O. "Monteith College of Wayne State University." In *Experimental Colleges,* edited by W. Hugh Stickler. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1964, pp. 145-156.

Sewell, Elizabeth. "Space for Something Else." New City, August 1968.

Shaw, Walter B. "Senior Student Perceptions of Justin Morrill College: Observations on the Achievement of the College Goals: Class of 1969." Unpublished Manuscript. Michigan State University, January 1970.

Spurr, Stephen. "Organization of the Liberal Arts in the Large University." *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1968, pp. 11-22.

Stickler, W. Hugh, ed. *Experimental Colleges.* Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

Time. September 9, 1966, pp. 46-47. Description of 17 cluster college programs.

Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Trow, Martin. "Methodological Problems in the Evaluation of Innovation." From the Proceedings of the Symposium on Problems in the Evaluation of Instruction. Los Angeles: University of California, December 1967. ED 031 820. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Tussman, Joseph. *Experiment at Berkeley.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

University of California, Santa Cruz 1969-70.

Watson, Goodwin. "Utopia and Rebellion: The New College Experiment." In *Innovation in Education,* edited by Matthew B. Miles. New York: Teachers College Press, 1964, pp. 97-115.

Wofford, Harris. "The New College at Old Westbury." *Educational Record,* Winter 1970.

____. "New College At Old Westbury." In *The Cluster College,* edited by Jerry G. Gaff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970, pp. 179-98.

Wolfe, Alan. "The Experimental College–Noble Contradiction." *Change*, March-April 1970, pp. 26-32.

Woodring, Paul. "The Idea of Cluster Colleges." *Saturday Review,* January 21, 1967.

Yeo, Richard D. "A Look at College Clustering." *Jounral of General Education,* January 1970.